UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,161	10/11/2000	Thomas Ralph Edward Greenwell	ORII2 001 APC	2199

20995	7590	01/14/2004

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/673,161	GREENWELL, THOMAS RALPH EDWARD
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Farhood Moslehi	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 October 2000_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-46_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _1-23_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _24-46_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-23 are canceled.

2.   Claims 24-46 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 24-29, 34,35 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Luzeski et al. (6,430,177) (hereinafter Luzeski).

5.   As per claim 24, Luzeski teaches a method of manipulating electronically

generated messages belonging to at least two of the following messages types: e-mail,

fax, video, pager, SMS, voice mail (e.g. Abstract); comprising handling the electronically

generated messages using a single messaging application (e.g. Abstract).

6.   As per claim 34, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

7.   As per claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

8.   As per claim 45, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

9.   As per claim 25, Luzeski teaches the method of manipulating electronically

generated messages wherein the single messaging application handles attributes of

messages, these attributes being shared by all of the message types (e.g. col. 13, lines 47-52).

10.   As per claim 26, Luzeski teaches the method of manipulating electronically generated messages wherein the single messaging application invokes or applies operations to the attributes of the messages, these operations being applicable to all the message types which are capable of being manipulates by the single messaging application (e.g. col2. 13 and 14, lines 63-67 and 1-4 respectively).

11.   As per claim 27, Luzeski teaches the method of manipulating electronically generated messages wherein the messaging application interfaces with one or more databases of loadable software code modules relating to at least one of message type specific attributes and operations (e.g. col. 5, lines 46-62).

12.   As per claim 28, Luzeski teaches the method of manipulating electronically generated messages, wherein a new messaging type can be dynamically added to a system whilst the system is fully operational by adding new loadable software code modules to one or more databases (e.g. cols. 5 and 6, lines 32-37 and 6-10 respectively).

13.   As per claim 29, Luzeski teaches the method of manipulating electronically generated messages wherein all user interface code is accessed through a database using loadable software code modules (e.g. col. 8, lines 11-20).

14.   Claims 30-33,36-39,42-44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jennings et al. (6,430,174) (hereinafter Jennings).

15.   As per claim 30, Jennings shows a software program for manipulating messages

of a given type, comprising loadable software code modules capable of interfacing with

a single messaging application, the loadable software code modules relating to at least

one of message type specific attributes and operations and the single messaging

application being operable to manipulate electronically generated messages belonging

to at least two of the following message types: e-mail, fax, video, pager, SMS and

voicemail (e.g. Abstract and col. 5, lines 60-67, Handheld Device Markup language and

JAVA are both capable of running different plug-ins during runtime).

16.   As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

17.   As per claim 46, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

18.   As per claim 31, Jennings shows the software program wherein the software

program is a dynamically loadable plug-in to the single messaging application (e.g. col.

5, lines 60-67, Handheld Device Markup language and JAVA are both capable of

running different plug-ins during runtime).

19.   As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

20.   As per claim 32, Jennings shows the software program wherein each loadable

software code module is individually capable of enabling the execution of one or more

tasks including:

a) Reporting to the single messaging application functional capabilities of one or more

loadable software code modules;

b) Supplying text for on-screen menus;

c) Creating, editing, displaying messages;

d) Converting messages to be sent by the application to a protocol and format required

by an external recipient and a conversion of messages received by the application to a

protocol and format required by the single messaging application (e.g. col. 5, lines 55-

67).

21.   As per claim 37, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

22.   As per claim 33, Jennings shows the software program wherein the loadable

software code is object oriented code which creates real objects to execute a task (e.g.

col. 5, lines 46-54).

23.   As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

24.   As per claim 38, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

25.   As per claim 44, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

26.   As per claim 39, Jennings shows the method of manipulating electronically

generated messages, wherein the messaging application can handle at least two of the

following messages types: e-mail, fax, video, pager, SMS, voicemail (e.g. col. 15, lines

47-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

27.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

28.   Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Jennings in view of Luzeski.

29.   As per claim 40, Jennings does not specifically show the method of manipulating

electronically generated messages wherein code to manipulate each message type is

accessed using several databases, each having loadable software code modules, each

database individually providing code modules relevant to the execution of one or more

of said tasks. Luzeski shows the method of manipulating electronically generated

messages wherein code to manipulate each message type is accessed using several

databases, each having loadable software code modules, each database individually

providing code modules relevant to the execution of one or more of said tasks (e.g. (e.g.

col. 5, lines 46-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to combine Jennings and Luzeski. The motivation would

have been for easier access to the loadable software modules.

30.   As per claim 41, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

31.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

32.   US Patent number 6,359,560 to Budge et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-

8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-

5484.

fm

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100